



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/492,242	01/27/2000	Andrew E. Kalman	P4300 9619	
24739	7590 08/07/2003			
CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY			EXAMINER	
PO BOX 18 AROMAS, (•		TANG, KENNETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2127	8
			DATE MAILED: 08/07/2003	, 0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Sil

<i></i>					
	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/492,242	KALMAN, ANDREW E.			
,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kenneth Tang	2127			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 31 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the status of the expiration date of the shortener (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. Insign and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see next page.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	: :				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:					

Applicant argues that "the context switching being restricted and constrained to the task level, and not being allowed to occur at other levels, is not really taught in Bronte, which teaches, much like other operating systems, that context switching is allowed at task level, but alos at many other levels." In response, however, it is pointed out in Bronte, col. 10, lines 11-12, that Bronte does teach restricting and constraining to the task level by preventing the nested level ("This prevents the case where calls are nested", col. 10, lines 11-12). Applicant's argument has been fully considered but is not deemed to be persuasive.

MAND BANDIKHAH PRIMARY EX -- NER